

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated January 2, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. New claim 8 has been added as a replacement to claim 6. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Ma et al., US 2005/0278737 (Hereinafter "Ma"). Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With respect to the rejections of claim 7, this claim has been cancelled so its rejections are now moot.

With respect to the 35 USC 101 rejection of claim 6, this claim has essentially been rewritten as claim 8 and it is believed it now conforms to statutory subject matter guidelines. With the language of new claim 8, Applicant believes that the reason for the examiner's rejection under 35 USC 101 has been obviated.

With respect to the 102(e) rejection, Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the examiner's reason for rejecting the claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. In a transmission system, a receiver for receiving programs from the transmission system, the receiver comprising

electronic program guide means for browsing through an electronic program guide containing information on a plurality of program channels, said electronic program guide means comprising

a server module and at least two client modules, each assigned to a respective remote device, in order that upon request of one or more of the remote devices, the server module manages the navigation of the one or more of the assigned client modules within the electronic program guide information.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that at least two remote server modules provide, to two respective devices, navigation capability of EPG information. This multi-user feature is not new matter as it is clearly recited throughout the specification. By way of example, the Abstract recites how “a server module and a number of client modules assigned to a number of remote devices” enable the system to provide EPG information to any one of the remote devices.

Ma et al. relates generally to interactive television, and more particularly, to a method for enhancing current electronic program guide technology by drawing upon information from at least two disparate content sources [0001]. Ma thus primarily addresses providing additional program data from sources other than the Electronic Program Guide (EPG) itself. As stated in his detailed description:

... due to certain bandwidth limitations, VBI does not support delivery of a more robust EPG to the viewer. In accordance with the present invention, rudimentary EPG data may be enhanced with additional EPG data retrieved from another disparate content source, such as the Internet. The bandwidth in digital broadcasting domain is significantly higher than that of VBI, however, due to inflexibility of

embedding most up to date data once they are authorized at the station, there is still a need to retrieve additional EPG data from other sources to supplement broadcast information. [0015]

Moreover, and as evidenced by Fig. 1 and 5 of Ma, only one remote device, PDA 14, is utilized. While Ma recites that other remote control devices may be used other than a PDA, only one such device is used at a time – there is no teaching or suggestion that multiple remote devices can be serviced. In fact, Ma teaches away from this feature:

[0021] The set-top box 52 further includes a user command module 60 and a [emphasis added] wireless transceiver device 62. The user command module 60 processes commands received from the PDA. For instance, when a request is received for VBI data, the user command module 60 retrieves the requested VBI data from the VBI data buffer and sends it back to the PDA. The VBI data is preferably transmitted by the [emphasis added] wireless transceiver device 62 using the Bluetooth protocol, IEEE 802.11b protocol or some other known wireless communication protocol. ...

[0022] The [emphasis added] PDA 14 serves as the [emphasis added] focal point for the viewer's interactive television watching experience. Various user interface applications 70 reside on the PDA 14. Amongst other functions, the applications 70 are designed to display and manipulate the enhanced EPG data for the viewer. Applications are preferably developed using Java or some other known application development tool.

The above described language of Ma and accompanying structure depicted in his Figs. 1 and 5 clearly describe a remote device whose function is to gather information beyond EPG data and present it to the viewer of the depicted television. This data is gathered by a single remote device (e.g., PDA 14). Such an invention is incompatible

with the present invention which enables multiple remote devices as claimed in claim 1 and as depicted in Fig. 1. It is also incompatible with the description contained in paragraph [0021] of the present invention whereby multiple set top boxes (STB) and their televisions are serviced by the multi-user program guide functionality of the invention as claimed in claim 1. That is, the features recited in claim 1 of the present invention enable this multiple STB capability – Ma’s invention does not.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Ma cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Ma fails to disclose each and every element recited. As shown, Ma fails to disclose the limitation of "a server module and at least two client modules, each assigned to a respective remote device, in order that upon request of one or more of the remote devices, the server module manages the navigation of the one or more of the assigned client modules within the electronic program guide information" as is recited in claim 1. Claims 2 and 4, 5, and 8 also contain this feature and are deemed patentable over Ma for at least the same reasons.


Having shown that Ma fails to disclose each and every element claimed, applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8 are allowable over Ma. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8.

With regard to claim 3, this claim depends from claim 2, which has been shown to be not anticipated and allowable in view of the cited references. Accordingly, claim 3 is also allowable by virtue of its dependence from an allowable base claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski  
Registration No. 42,079



By: Thomas Onka  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,053

Date: March 31, 2008

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

**Certificate of Mailing/Transmission Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313-1450 or transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No (571) 273-8300 on \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Registered Rep.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature and Date)